

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSENDER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.upote.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/562,058	01/29/2007	Ronald A. Marino	043057-0376956	4142
27498 7591 0309/2010 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP P.O. BOX 10500			EXAMINER	
			DINH, TRINH VO	
MCLEAN, VA 22102			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2821	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/09/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket_ip@pillsburylaw.com

Application No. Applicant(s) 10/562.058 MARINO ET AL. Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit Trinh Vo Dinh 2821 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS. WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 February 2010. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are; a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date

Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (FTO/SB/08)

Attachment(s)

Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date.

6) Other:

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

Application/Control Number: 10/562,058 Page 2

Art Unit: 2821

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic

invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as

to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

I. An apparatus/a method for an antenna configuration.

II. A Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) reader system.

III. A Radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system.

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species 1: Claims 1-11 and 25-27.

Species II: Claims 12-15.

Species III. Claims 16-24.

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special

technical features for the following reasons:

Species 1 draws to an antenna configuration, among with other features, including

first reader antenna having first, second and third reader antenna in first, second and third

respectively planes, the first antenna having a first loop encircling a volume in a first

plane, the second reader antenna has a second loop form wrapped around two opposing

sides of the volume wherein the opposing sides are parallel to each other and orthogonal

to the first plane.

Species II draws to a radio Frequency Identification (RFID) reader system, among other features, a container including a form factor/container, a supporting surface for supporting DVD products, a rear plane and a retaining structure,

Species III draws to a radio Frequency Identification (RFID) system, among with other features, a container including inner transparent to RF energy, and an outer shell blocked RF energy, a first reader antenna is in the form of a loop substantially surround a volume of the container wherein a second reader antenna is in a form of a loop in a plane parallel with one side of the container and at least one non-planar RFID tag is affixed to a bottle having a cylinder shape.

 The species are independent or distinct because as disclosed the different species have mutually exclusive characteristics for each identified species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper because all these species listed in this action are independent or distinct for the reasons given above <u>and</u> there would be a serious search and examination burden if restriction were not required <u>because one or more of</u> the following reasons apply:

- (a) The prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to Another species;
- (b) The species have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their Different classification;
- c) The species have acquired a separate status in the art due to their Recognized divergent subject matter;

queries);

(d) The species require a different field of search (for example, searching Different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search

(e) The species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable upon the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Inquiry

 Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trinh Vo Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1821. The examiner can normally be reached on IFW (Increase Flexible Work).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Douglas Owens can be reached on (571) 272-1662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

February 23, 2010

/Trinh Vo Dinh/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2821